## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

ERIC DEWAYNE CATHEY,	§	
Petitioner,	§	
	§	
v.	§	No. 4:15-CV-2883
	§	DEATH PENALTY CASE
BOBBY LUMPKIN, Director,	§	
Texas Department of Criminal	§	
Justice, Correctional	§	
Institutions Division,	§	
Respondent.	§	

## RESPONDENT LUMPKIN'S OPPOSED MOTION FOR A PROPOSED SCHEDULING ORDER

Pursuant to the Court's order from March 31, 2022, the parties have conferred but are unable to agree on a joint proposed scheduling order. See ECF No. 43. In accordance with the Fifth Circuit's authorization order, "[t]his Court must conclusively decide whether federal law provides Cathey a second opportunity for habeas review." ECF No. 31; see In re Cathey, 857 F.3d 221, 226 (5th Cir. 2017) ("Our grant of a motion to file a successive petition is 'tentative in the following sense: the district court must dismiss the motion that we have allowed the applicant to file, without reaching the merits of the motion, if the court finds that the movant has not satisfied the requirements for the filing of such a motion. The district court then is the second gate through which the petitioner must pass before the merits of his or her motion are heard."). The Court is also required to address timeliness. Id. at 240-41. On

remand, this Court must "effect [the Fifth Circuit's mandate]" and "do nothing

else." Perez v. Stephens, 784 F.3d 276, 280 (5th Cir. 2015) (quoting

General Universal Sys., Inc. v. HAL, Inc., 500 F.3d 444, 453 (5th Cir.

2004)). As such, Respondent proposes the following scheduling order:

Petitioner and Respondent shall file simultaneous briefing on or before 120 days from the Court's entry of a scheduling order limited solely to addressing this Court's jurisdiction, see 28 U.S.C.

§ 2244(b), and any argument regarding the timeliness of the

petition, see 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1).

The Fifth Circuit's order limits this Court's initial review to

successiveness and the statute of limitations. Nevertheless, in future briefing.

the Respondent reserves the right to raise any defense or argument, including

but not limited to those described in Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section

2254 Cases, or those found in 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241, 2244, 2254, with respect to

the present or any amended petition and any claim or evidence attached or

raised therein.

Dated: April 29, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

KEN PAXTON

Attorney General of Texas

BRENT WEBSTER

First Assistant Attorney General

2

JOSH RENO Deputy Attorney General for Criminal Justice

EDWARD L. MARSHALL Chief, Criminal Appeals Division

\* Lead counsel

<u>s/ Eran S. Sharon</u>
\*ERAN S. SHARON
Assistant Attorney General
Texas Bar No. 24075889
Southern District Bar No. 3573380

P. O. Box 12548, Capitol Station Austin, Texas 78711 Tel: (512) 936-1400 Fax: (512) 320-8132 eran.sharon@oag.texas.gov

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

I hereby certify that I corresponded with counsel for Petitioner via e-mail

and was unable to come to an agreement regarding a proposed scheduling

order.

s/ Eran S. Sharon

ERAN S. SHARON

Assistant Attorney General

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that on April 29, 2022, I electronically filed the

foregoing pleading with the Clerk of the Court for the U.S. District Court,

Southern District of Texas, using the electronic case-filing system of the Court.

The electronic case-filing system sent a "Notice of Filing" to the following

attorneys of record, who consented in writing to accept this Notice as service

of this document by electronic means.

Layne E. Kruse

NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP

1301 McKinney, Suite 5100

Houston, Texas 77010

<u>layne.kruse@nortonrosefulbright.com</u>

s/ Eran S. Sharon

ERAN S. SHARON

Assistant Attorney General

4